

1328restreq

I hereby certify that this paper (1 page) is being facsimile
transmitted to the USPTO on the date shown below.

Edward Langer Date June 16 '02
Edward Langer, Reg. No. 30,564

#4 / Election
6-20-02
L. Spruell

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of : NITZAN, Boaz, et al.

Serial No. : 09/822,500

Filed : April 2, 2001

For : OFFSET PRINTING PLATE FOR DIRECT INKJET CTP

Group Art Unit 2854

Examiner: Stephen R. Funk

Raanana, Israel

June 16, 2002

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

16.06.02

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the Office Action mailed May 23, 2002 containing a restriction requirement, Applicant provisionally elects the claims relating to the pretreatment composition, labelled Group II by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's argument that the inventions of Group I and Group II are distinct. Applicant believes that the product and process are not distinct inventions, as they are related as product and process of use, and that the product is specifically for use in the process, therefore the restriction requirement between Groups I and II should be withdrawn. Applicant believes a generic claim can be drawn to the product and the process to provide adequate coverage.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Langer
Edward Langer, Attorney

Reg. No. 30,564

FAX COPY RECEIVED

JUN 14 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800